

MATTHEW D. POWERS (Bar No. 104795)  
matthew.powers@weil.com  
JARED BOBROW (Bar No. 133712)  
jared.bobrow@weil.com  
SONAL N. MEHTA (Bar No. 222086)  
sonal.mehta@weil.com  
DEREK C. WALTER (Bar. No. 246322)  
derek.walter@weil.com  
NATHAN GREENBLATT (Bar No. 262279)  
nathan.greenblatt@weil.com  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
Silicon Valley Office  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 802-3000  
Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff  
Apple Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ELAN MICROELECTRONICS  
CORPORATION,

Plaintiff and Counterclaim  
Defendant,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant and Counterclaim  
Plaintiff.

Case No. C-09-01531 RS (PSG)

**APPLE INC.'S NOTICE OF MOTION  
AND MOTION TO COMPEL ELAN'S  
COMPLIANCE WITH THE PARTIES'  
AGREEMENT THAT ELAN  
EMPLOYEES WILL BE PRESENTED  
FOR DEPOSITION IN THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA**

DATE: August 2, 2011  
TIME: 10:00 a.m.  
JUDGE: Hon. Paul Singh Grewal  
CTRM: 5, 4th Floor

**MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME AND  
RESET HEARING DATE TO JULY 5,  
2011 AT 10:00 AM FILED  
CONCURRENTLY HEREWITH**

1 **NOTICE OF MOTION**

2 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on August 2, 2011 at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as  
 4 counsel may be heard by the above-entitled Court, Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff Apple  
 5 Inc. ("Apple"), will and hereby does respectfully move to compel Plaintiff and Counterclaim  
 6 Defendant Elan Microelectronics Corporation ("Elan") to comply with the parties' agreement that  
 7 party witnesses will be presented for deposition in the Northern District of California. This  
 8 motion is based upon the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of  
 9 Sonal N. Mehta, and a Proposed Order, each of which are served and filed concurrently herewith,  
 10 as well as the complete record of this action, evidence and argument that may be presented at a  
 11 hearing on this motion, and all matters of which the Court may take judicial notice. For the  
 12 reasons set forth in greater detail in the Memorandum of Points and Authorities and related  
 13 pleadings submitted herewith, Apple respectfully requests the Court to Order Elan to produce the  
 14 requested discovery forthwith. A motion to shorten time and reset the hearing on this motion to  
 15 July 5, 2011, so it can be heard with pending motion relating to the same agreement between the  
 16 parties, is being filed concurrently herewith.

17 **I.**

18 **THE COURT SHOULD ENFORCE THE PARTIES' AGREEMENT THAT PARTY**  
 19 **WITNESSES WILL APPEAR FOR DEPOSITION IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF**  
 20 **CALIFORNIA**

21 As Apple explained in its May 31, 2011 motion to compel, Elan contends that it is a  
 22 Taiwanese company with little or no U.S. presence. Although Apple disputes that this prevents  
 23 Elan from having substantial relevant knowledge regarding the presence of its products in the  
 24 United States, it does not dispute that Elan's research and business activities and the majority of  
 25 its employees are located in Taiwan. Accordingly, from the outset of this case, Apple  
 26 immediately met and conferred with Elan to confirm that it would make its inventors and  
 27 employees voluntarily available for deposition in this district, where Elan initiated suit. With the  
 28 exception of specific inventors and employees that Elan was to identify prior to September 18,  
 2009, Elan agreed that it would do so. This agreement was memorialized in the parties

1 September 2009 Joint Case Management Conference Statement:

2           The parties agree that named inventors and employees of the parties  
3           that do not reside in the United States will be made voluntarily  
4           available for deposition in the Northern District of California  
          without service of foreign process except as so identified to the  
          opposing party no later than September 18, 2009.

5 Dkt. No. 41 at 6. Prior to September 18, 2009, Elan did not identify any individuals that it would  
6 be unable to make available for deposition. In advance of the January 2011 CMC, the foregoing  
7 agreement was re-memorialized in the Further Case Management Conference Statement. *See* Dkt  
8 No. 187 at 3. In that same document, the parties confirmed that neither of them had identified  
9 any unavailable witnesses by the September 18, 2009 deadline. *Id.* Thus, Elan has agreed on  
10 multiple occasions that it would make its inventors and employees voluntarily available for  
11 deposition here in the United States. Despite the foregoing, Elan has refused to make its  
12 inventors available for deposition in California, alleging that because the inventors are no longer  
13 employees, Elan is powerless to make them available. Apple has already brought a motion to  
14 compel on this issue, which is schedule to be heard on July 5.

15           Unfortunately, in addition to refusing making its non-employee inventors available for  
16 deposition, Elan has also recently refused to make even its **current** employees available for  
17 deposition in the Northern District of California, in either their individual or 30(b)(6) capacities.  
18 As Elan stated in meet and confer, “it is Elan’s position that Section IV.B of the Joint CMC only  
19 applies to Elan’s claims in this action.” *See* Declaration of Sonal Mehta in Support of Apple  
20 Inc.’s Motion to Compel Elan’s Compliance with the Parties’ Agreement That Elan Employees  
21 Will be Presented for Deposition in the Northern District of California (“Mehta Decl.”), Exh. A  
22 [6/13/2011 email correspondence]. In other words, Elan now contends that the parties’ agreement  
23 to make witnesses available for deposition in California only applies to witnesses that can provide  
24 testimony regarding the patent infringement allegations that Elan is bringing in this Court.

25           There is no basis for this position. At the outset, there is no language in the parties’  
26 agreement to this effect, nor was there any discussion to this effect during the negotiation of the  
27 agreement. *See* Mehta Decl. ¶ 2. This is particularly noteworthy because Elan was well aware of  
28 Apple’s counterclaims—which were filed on July 1, 2009—months in advance of the September

1 30, 2009 CMC statement, where Elan agreed to make its employees available for deposition in  
 2 California. *See* Dkt No. 41 (Sept. 30, 2009 CMC statement); Dkt. No 15 (Apple's First Amended  
 3 Answer asserting counterclaims filed on July 1, 2009). Thus, if, as Elan contends, it truly  
 4 intended for the parties' agreement to apply only to its counterclaims, it surely would have raised  
 5 this issue with Apple or requested that the agreement include language to this effect. It did not.  
 6 To the contrary, over a year later, after the parties had spent substantial resources litigating  
 7 Apple's counterclaims, Elan even reaffirmed the original agreement in the January 20, 2011  
 8 further CMC statement, again without any suggestion that it would seek to limit the agreement to  
 9 only Elan's claims. It was not until June 10, 2011 that Elan let Apple know for the first time that  
 10 it would not present its witnesses in the Northern District of California.<sup>1</sup> Mehta Decl., Exh. A  
 11 [6/13/2011 email correspondence] (June 10, 2011 email from J. Bu stating Elan's position that the  
 12 parties' agreement only applies to Elan's claims).

13 With respect to 30(b)(6) depositions specifically, Elan contends that "Apple's 30(b)(6)  
 14 topics only relate to Apple's counterclaims." *See id.* Elan is wrong again. In fact, Apple's notice  
 15 includes topics related to the conception and reduction to practice of the Elan patents-in-suit,  
 16 Elan's knowledge of Apple's alleged infringement, marking, and Elan's damages case. All of  
 17 these topics relate to Elan's claims, not Apple's. Moreover, even if all of Apple's 30(b)(6) topics  
 18 related only to its counterclaims, that still would not provide a basis for abrogating the parties'  
 19 agreement regarding deposition location.

20 Finally, it must be noted that Elan initiated this action by suing Apple in this forum. It has  
 21 thus chosen to avail itself of the Northern District of California. In these circumstances, even  
 22 beyond the parties' express agreement that employees and inventors are to be made available for  
 23 deposition in California, Elan simply cannot be heard to complain if it is forced to present  
 24

---

25 <sup>1</sup> During meet and confer, Elan has taken the position that its employees should be deposed  
 26 in Taiwan for efficiency reasons. Briefly, Elan contends that if depositions are conducted in  
 27 Taiwan, to the extent one of its witnesses is unprepared with relevant information, it will be able  
 28 to quickly identify and present a substitute witness among its employees. However, if Elan  
 properly prepares its Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses, there should be no need for it to identify substitute  
 witnesses in the first place. Furthermore, with respect to witnesses who testify in their individual  
 capacities, this rationale is totally inapplicable.

witnesses here.

**II.**

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Apple's motion to compel should be granted.

Dated: June 28, 2011

By: /s/ Sonal N. Mehta

Sonal N. Mehta  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaim Plaintiff Apple Inc.